

Diffuse Baryons in Groups and Clusters of Galaxies

A. Cavaliere

*Astrofisica, Dip. Fisica, II Università di Roma,
via Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma, Italy*

N. Menci

*Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, via Osservatorio, 00040 Monteporzio, Italy
and*

P. Tozzi

*Astrofisica, Dip. Fisica, II Università di Roma,
via Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma, Italy*

ABSTRACT

To predict the X-ray observables associated with the diffuse baryons in clusters of galaxies, we develop a new physical model for such a hot intra-cluster plasma. Our framework is provided by the hierarchical clustering cosmogony for the dark matter, and by the standard FRW or Lemaitre cosmologies constrained by cosmic ages.

As to the plasma dynamics and thermodynamics we propose a semi-analytical approach based on *punctuated equilibria*. This comprises the following blocks that we compute in detail: Monte Carlo “merging histories” to describe the dynamics of dark matter condensations on scales of order 1 – 10 Mpc, and the associated evolution of the gravitational potential wells; the central *hydrostatic* disposition for the ICP, reset to a new equilibrium after each merging episode; conditions of shock, or of closely adiabatic compression at the *boundary* with the external gas, preheated by stellar energy feedbacks. Shocks of substantial strength are shown to prevail at the outskirts of rich clusters in a universe with decelerated expansion.

From our model we predict the $L - T$ relation, consistent with the data as for shape and scatter. This we combine with the mass distribution provided by the canonical hierarchical clustering; the initial perturbation spectra are dominated by Cold Dark Matter but include enough baryons to account for the high abundance sampled by the X-ray clusters, and are COBE-normalized. Thus we predict the z -resolved luminosity functions, with the associated source counts and redshift distributions. We predict also the complementary contribution by the unresolved groups and clusters to the soft X-ray background.

These results are compared with two recent surveys from ROSAT; one defines the local luminosity function over nearly three decades of L , and the other shows little or no evolution out to $z \sim 0.8$.

Our results confirm that the critical cosmology coupled with Standard CDM is ruled out by its overproduction of local clusters. On account of underproduction, instead, we rule out open cosmologies (the cheapest way to solve the baryonic crisis and to freeze evolution), except for a narrow range around $\Omega_o = 0.5$; even there, we find the consistency with the full data base to be hardly marginal. For the CDM cosmogony with $\Omega_o = 0.3$ but in flat geometry, we obtain acceptable fits. For the tilted CDM perturbation spectrum with high baryonic content in the critical universe, we obtain marginal consistency. The cosmogonical/cosmological sectors of the cluster history are independently testable by means of a lower bound to the evolved temperature distribution, as can be measured with SAX and XMM out to moderate z .

Finally, we discuss the effective limitations of X-ray clusters and groups as cosmological signposts, and their brighter prospects toward the astrophysics of the ICP and the cosmogony of large, high-contrast structures.

Subject headings: galaxies: clustering – galaxies: intergalactic medium – galaxies: X-rays – hydrodynamics

1. Introduction

Groups and clusters of galaxies constitute cosmic structures sufficiently close to equilibrium and with sufficient density contrast ($\delta \approx 2 \cdot 10^2$ inside the virial radius R) as to yield definite observables, and possibly to offer reliable signposts for cosmology.

They stand out to substantial depths of space-time not only in the optical band, but even more in X-rays. This is because their gravitational potential wells, shaped by a dominant dark mass M , contain not only baryons condensed into stars but also a larger amount of *diffuse baryons*. The latter, with densities $n \sim 10^{-3} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and virial temperatures $kT \sim GMm_H/10R \sim 5 \text{ keV}$ in rich clusters, satisfy the plasma condition $kT/e^2 n^{1/3} \gg 1$ exceedingly well; in fact, they do by a factor 10^{11} , vastly larger than for the baryons inside the stars. Such a hot *intra-cluster plasma* (ICP) emits powerful X-ray luminosities $L \propto n^2 R_X^3 T^{1/2} \sim 10^{44} \text{ erg/s}$ by optically thin thermal bremsstrahlung from central regions of overall radius $R_X \sim 1 \text{ Mpc}$.

The temperature directly probes the height of the potential well, with the baryons in the role of mere tracers; on the other hand, the luminosity with its strong dependence on density reliably probes the baryonic content. Statistically, a definite $L-T$ correlation is observed (albeit with considerable scatter), and this provides the crucial link to relate the X-ray luminosity functions with the statistics of the dark mass M or with that of the corresponding T .

But groups and clusters are intrinsically complex systems. To begin with, their dynamical history is marked by extensive, repeated *merging* of clumps, both in the form of nearly isotropic accretion of small units, and in the form of a few large, anisotropic coalescence events. This is shown in detail by all N-body simulations (see, e.g., Schindler & Mueller 1993; Tormen 1997; Roettiger, Stone & Mushotzky 1997), and is increasingly indicated by the data (see, e.g., Zabludoff & Zaritsky 1995; Henriksen & Markevitch 1996; Jones et al. 1997).

The timing of such a dynamical evolution (and specifically the present merging rate) is set by the *cosmological* framework. Adopting the homogeneous isotropic FRW or Lemaître cosmologies, the expansion is parametrized by the Hubble constant h (in units of 100 km/s Mpc), and by the density parameter Ω_o (to which the baryons contribute the fraction Ω_B); a possible additional contribution is given by Ω_Λ

associated to the cosmological constant.

Given the cosmological framework, the *cosmogony* (i.e., the process of structure formation) is treated in terms of the standard hierarchical clustering scenario (see Peebles 1993), where all structures form by gravitational instability of initial density perturbations δ in the dark matter (hereafter DM). Important parameters are the shape of their power spectrum $\langle |\delta_k|^2 \rangle \propto k^{n_p} T^2(k)$ at the recombination, and the normalization measured at large scales by COBE/DMR (Gorsky et al. 1996). The transmission function $T(k)$ depends on the specific model assumed for the DM; given this, the amplitude σ_8 (i.e., the normalization extrapolated down to the relevant scale $8 h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$) and the effective spectral slope n_e depend on Ω_o and h . These parameters also affect the growth factor $D(z)$ of the perturbations, which enters the actual predictions for the mass distributions of the condensed clusters or groups (see Appendix A).

Further complexity is added by the *physics* of the ICP, and this constitutes our main aim here. To now, the ratio of the ICP to DM, and specifically its central density n_o and its effective radius are poorly understood. But the former is especially important, as the factor n_o^2 enters the luminosities and *amplifies* the observed variance.

Observational information on the ICP and on the underlying DM dynamics is provided by the local $L-T$ correlation. At higher z , further statistical information is provided by the evolution of the X-ray luminosity function $N(L, z)$, or by its integrals like the source counts or the z -distributions. The problem is that the predictions of observables involve not only the ICP physics and the cosmogony (with their intrinsic variances) but also cosmology again (with its uncertainties), and so the various aspects are not easily disentangled.

The sharpest result obtained so far rules out the attractively simple assumption by Kaiser (1986) that the ICP amount be proportional to the DM's from groups to clusters at all z and M . A large number of subsequent works (of which we cite here the recent Mathiesen & Evrard 1997, Kitayama & Suto 1997, and Borgani et al. 1998) dealt with the combinations of these three *sectors*, namely, cosmology, cosmogony and ICP physics. But most of these papers, following the start by Cavaliere & Colafrancesco (1988), approached the problem by parameterizing the dependences of the ICP/DM ratio on M and z , e.g., in the form $L \propto M^p (1+z)^s$. While the parameters p and s

are constrained to some extent by the local $L - T$ correlation, nevertheless there still remains a substantial *degeneracy* (Oukbir, Bartlett & Blanchard 1997) between ICP physics and cosmology/cosmogony. That is to say, different combinations of h , Ω_o , Ω_λ , Ω_B , σ_8 , n_p , s , p provide close fits to the observables. Conversely, when the ICP parameters are varied, different cosmologies appear to be preferred by the data; the trade off particularly concerns Ω_o and s , which directly govern the global and the ICP evolution, respectively.

To go beyond such degeneracies a *physical* model is needed for the ICP, including the above complexities. Such a model must include: the histories of DM halos with their hierarchical merging events; the infall of the gas with the ensuing compression and shocks; the disposition of the ICP in the potential wells; its conditions at the boundary with the surrounding environment, which is modulated by the large scale structures and by stellar preheating. A model accounting for all the above is missing so far. We stress that the simulations using advanced hydrodynamics coupled with N-body codes hardly reach at present enough dynamic range (as discussed by Bryan & Norman 1997) to describe DM and ICP over the full range from ~ 50 Mpc associated with the large scale structures (which guide the ongoing mergers of DM halos), to the inner 50 kpc where the ICP yields a considerable contribution to L . On the other hand, such high-resolution simulations do not include yet the stellar preheating with its crucial effects on the LT relation.

This motivates us to develop here a semi-analytical model which includes, though in a simplified form, the features listed above. We describe the cluster evolution as a sequence of *punctuated equilibria* (PE); that is to say, a sequence of hierarchical merging episodes of the DM halos (computed with Monte Carlo simulations), associated in the ICP to shocks of various strengths (depending on the mass ratio of the merging clumps), which provide the boundary conditions for the ICP to re-adjust to a new hydrostatic equilibrium. We show that our PE model predicts density and temperature profiles and the $L - T$ relation for clusters and groups consistent with the recent data.

We then use our PE to predict the counts of resolved sources $N(> F)$ for faint fluxes down to $F > 2 \cdot 10^{-14}$ erg/s cm², now accurately measured by Rosati et al. (1997). We predict also the *complementary* observable constituted by the contribution of the unresolved groups and clusters to the soft X-ray back-

ground (XRB). We predict the z -distributions, and finally the full z -resolved luminosity functions to be compared with recent and forthcoming surveys.

The paper is organized as follows. In §2 we present and discuss our approach to the ICP astrophysics. In §3 we give the X-ray observables in the form suited to our hierarchical clustering computations; details are supplied in the Appendixes A, B and C. In §4 we present the results from our approach. The final §5 is devoted to discussions and conclusions.

2. The punctuated equilibria for the ICP

The X-ray luminosity of a cluster with radial temperature profile $T(r)$ and density profile $n(r)$ is given by

$$L \propto \int d^3r n^2(r) T^{1/2}(r) ; \quad (1)$$

the integration is over the emitting volume $r^3 \leq R^3$. Expressing R from $T \propto M/R \propto \rho R^2$, eq. (1) recast into the form

$$L \propto \overline{[n(r)/n_1]^2} T^2 \rho^{1/2} , \quad (2)$$

where ρ is the internal DM density, n_1 is the density just exterior to the cluster boundary, and the bar indicates the integration over the cluster volume normalized to R^3 . Note that eq. (2) applies in the isothermal case; the corresponding expression for a polytropic ICP is given in Appendix B.

The simplest approach to the ICP state is that adopted in the self-similar model (Kaiser 1986) where $n \propto \rho$ is assumed, independently of T ; then $L \propto T^2$ obtains from eq. (2). The result conflicts with the observed correlation for rich clusters which is close to $L \propto T^3$ (Edge & Stewart 1991; Mushotzky 1994; Tsuru et al. 1996; Mushotzky & Scharf 1997). Also, when combined with the standard hierarchical cosmogony, the assumption yields unacceptable fits to the local luminosity function (see, e.g., Kitayama & Suto 1997). Finally, it would predict the clusters at higher z to comprise not only denser DM, but also equally denser ICP; since bremsstrahlung depends on n^2 , this would imply a strong positive evolution of $N(L, z)$, which is certainly *not* observed. Rather, the analysis of the ROSAT Brightest Cluster Sample (Ebeling et al. 1997) and of the ROSAT Deep Cluster Survey by Rosati et al. (1997), extending and strengthening the data by Collins et al. (1997) and by Nichol et al. (1997), indicate no evolution out to $z \approx 0.8$ for $L < 3 \cdot 10^{44}$ erg/s; earlier surveys (EMSS,

Henry et al. 1992) suggested even a (marginal) negative evolution of the bright clusters.

So to derive the true *scaling* of L with T we need a closer analysis of the ICP disposition relative to the DM. We propose a new approach based upon two cornerstones: the profiles $n(r)$ and $T(r)$ are given by the *hydrostatic* equilibrium with the gradually changing gravitational potential; their normalizations, and so the central density, are set by the conditions at the *boundary* with the external medium.

The equilibrium profile may be effectively represented with a polytropic relation starting from the cluster boundary at r_2 , say:

$$n(r)/n_1 = g(T) \left[\frac{T(r)}{T_2} \right]^{1/(\gamma-1)}. \quad (3)$$

Here T_2 is the temperature just interior to the boundary; we conveniently use $g(T) \equiv n_2/n_1$ for the ratio of the interior to the exterior density, to include any shock discontinuity at the boundary. The appropriate values for γ will be discussed in §2.1 and §2.4.

Actually, the ICP is reset to a *new* equilibrium after each episode of accretion or merging of further mass. In our PE approach, the history of such episodes is followed in the framework of the hierarchical clustering by Monte Carlo simulations, as explained below.

Two relevant *limiting* forms of eq. (3) are constituted by the “shock” model of CMT97, and by the “adiabatic” models of Kaiser (1991) and of Evrard & Henry (1991). In both the outer gas is expected to be *preheated* at $T_1 \lesssim 1$ keV (Ciotti et al. 1991; David et al. 1993, 1995; Renzini 1997) by $z \lesssim 2$, due to feedback energy inputs following star formation and evolution. Preheating temperatures $T_1 \gtrsim 0.1$ keV also would prevent the cooling catastrophe from occurring, see White & Rees (1978); Blanchard, Valls Gabaud & Mamon (1992). In point of fact, Henriksen & White (1996) find from X-rays evidence for diffuse cool gas at $0.5 - 1$ keV in the outer regions of a number of clusters. In the present context, preheating will inhibit the attainment of the universal baryonic density in gravitational wells with virial temperatures comparable to T_1 .

These limiting models differ in their treatment of the boundary conditions and of the merging histories.

2.1. Shocks and hydrostatic equilibrium

The key boundary condition is provided by the dynamic stress balance $P_2 = P_1 + m_H n_1 v_1^2$, relating the

exterior and interior pressures P_2 and P_1 to the inflow velocity v_1 driven by the gravitational potential at the boundary. We expect the inflowing gas to become supersonic in the vicinity of R , when $m_H v_1^2 > 2kT_1$. In fact, many hydrodynamical simulations of loose gas accretion into a cluster (from Perrenod 1980 to Takizawa & Mineshige 1997) show shocks to form, to convert most of the bulk energy into thermal energy, and to expand slowly remaining close to the virial radius for some dynamical times. So we take $r_2 \approx R$ (which follows the structure growth, since $R \propto M^{1/3}$), and focus on nearly static conditions inside, with $v_2^2 \ll v_1^2$.

The post-shock state is set by conservations across the shock not only of the stresses, but also of mass and energy, as described by the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions (see Appendix B). These provide at the boundary the temperature jump T_2/T_1 , and the corresponding density jump g which reads

$$g\left(\frac{T_2}{T_1}\right) = 2\left(1 - \frac{T_1}{T_2}\right) + \left[4\left(1 - \frac{T_1}{T_2}\right)^2 + \frac{T_1}{T_2}\right]^{1/2} \quad (4)$$

for a plasma with three degrees of freedom. Eq. (4) includes both *weak* and *strong* shocks. For weak shocks with $T_2 \approx T_1$ (appropriate for small groups accreting preheated gas, or for rich clusters accreting comparable clumps), this converges to the truly adiabatic relationship $n_2/n_1 = (T_2/T_1)^{3/2}$ up to second order inclusive, see Landau & Lifshitz (1959). On the other hand, it is shown in Appendix B that for strong shocks (appropriate to “cold inflow” as in rich clusters accreting small clumps and diffuse gas) the approximation $kT_2 \approx -\phi_2/3 + 3kT_1/2$ holds, where ϕ_2 is the gravitational potential energy at $r_2 \simeq R$.

Inside R , the temperature and density profiles $T(r)$ and $n(r)$ are matched to T_2 and to n_2 by *polytropic* profiles or by their *isothermal* limit. We numerically compute such profiles using the hydrostatic support of pressure against gravity (see Appendix B); for definiteness, we use the Navarro et al. (1996) representation for the potential and for the velocity dispersion (which varies slowly in the relevant region).

Let us consider first for reference the simple analytical approximation provided by the standard isothermal model

$$n(r)/n_2 = [\rho(r)/\rho_2]^\beta, \quad (5)$$

(Cavaliere & Fusco-Femiano 1976) with the canonical exponent $\beta \equiv \mu m_H \sigma / kT_2$; here σ is the one-dimensional velocity dispersion at R , and μ is the

average molecular weight. For the purpose of the analytical approximation we may use the strong shock limit for T_2 , and find numerical values for β ranging from about 0.5 for groups to 0.9 for rich clusters (a trend consistent with data being collected by M. Girardi and coauthors, private communication). This implies that R_X/R is larger in the former than in the latter (see CMT97).

The full numerical computations using the expression for T_2 given in Appendix B, and $\sigma(r)$ and $\phi(r)$ from Navarro et al. (1996) confirm this trend and give results shown in fig. 1. Note that even in the isothermal case the emission-weighted temperature (integrated along the line of sight) declines outwards but only very slowly.

The observed stronger decline requires a polytropic equilibrium, where the run of $T(r)$ steepens with the index γ increasing from 1. In the Appendix B we recall the basic relations, and show that the variations induced in the volume-averaged luminosity by increasing γ are small. Thereafter, we adopt the value $\gamma = 1.2$, which also yields for rich clusters an integrated baryonic fraction 0.15 out to R . The result for the emission-weighted $T(r)$ (see fig. 1) is a mild decrease out to $r \sim 1$ Mpc in agreement with the observations (Hughes, Gorenstein & Fabricant 1988; Honda et al. 1997; Markevitch et al. 1997), followed by a sharper drop as indicated by state-of-the-art simulations (e.g., Bryan & Norman 1997). Note that in fig. 1 the discontinuity at the shock has been smeared out to a smooth drop by the finite resolution, taken at 100 kpc for comparison with the simulations and with the forthcoming observations.

2.2. Merging histories and the L - T correlation

The luminosity $L \propto g^2 \overline{n^2(r)/n_1^2} T^2 \rho^{1/2}$ is statistically affected by the *merging histories* as follows. For a cluster or group of a given mass (or temperature), the effective compression factor squared $\langle g^2 \rangle$ is obtained upon averaging eq. (4) over the sequence of the DM merging events; in such events, T_2 is the virial temperature of the receiving structure, and T_1 is the higher between the stellar preheating temperature and that from “gravitational” heating, i.e., the virial value prevailing in the clumps being accreted.

All that is accounted for in our model using Monte Carlo simulations of the hierarchical growth of the DM halos; these are based on merging trees corre-

sponding to the excursion set approach of Bond et al. (1991), consistent with the Press & Schechter (1974) statistics (see CMT97). The averaging procedure is dominated by the events occurring within the last few dynamical times; it results in lowering $\langle g^2 \rangle$ compared to g^2 , because in many events the accreted gas is at a temperature higher than the minimum preheating value $T_{1\ell} \approx 0.5$ keV. In addition, an intrinsic *variance* is generated, reflecting and amplifying the variance intrinsic to the merging histories.

The net result is shown in fig 2, and commented in its caption. In agreement with the observations (Edge & Stewart 1991; Mushotzky 1994; Tsuru et al. 1996; Ponman et al. 1996), the *shape* of the average L - T relation flattens from $L \propto T^5$ at the group scale (where the nuclear energy from stellar preheating competes with the gravitational energy from infall) to $L \propto T^3$ at the rich cluster scales. At higher temperatures the shape asymptotes to $L \propto T^2$, the self-similar scaling of pure gravity. Notice the intrinsic *scatter* due to the variance in the dynamical merging histories, but amplified by the n^2 dependence of L .

The average normalization formally rises like $\rho^{1/2}(z)$, where ρ is the effective external mass density which increases as $(1+z)^2$ (Cavaliere & Menci 1997) in filamentary large scale structures hosting most groups and clusters (see Ramella, Geller & Huchra 1992). This implies a factor 1.3 at $z = 0.3$, consistent with the observations by Mushotzky & Scharf (1997). Further weakening of the z -dependence will come from the increasing depth of the central ϕ_o for distant structures of given M , as predicted by Navarro, Frenk & White (1996).

2.3. The adiabatic models

At the other extreme, the models by Kaiser (1991), and Evrard & Henry (1991) obtain from PE under two limits, appropriate only for rapidly expanding universes, as we discuss below. The first limit correspond to no currently active merging, with shocks moving outward and vanishing. In such conditions, at the boundary $T_2 \approx T_1$ holds; with T_1 staying nearly constant after the dynamical freeze out, this implies $g \equiv n_2/n_1 \approx 1$. Correspondingly, the central density scales approximately as $n_o \propto n_1 (T_o/T_1)^{1/(\gamma-1)}$.

The “adiabatic” models require also a second limit, concerning the internal gas distribution. The value $\gamma = 5/3$ is taken at the center, but an isothermal β profile is assumed (with a fixed β), based on a King-

like DM distribution. A constant baryonic fraction at R is then required, and this forces the core radius to scale as $r_c \propto M^{1/3-1/3\beta}$. Thus $L \propto T^{2+3(2-1/\beta)/2}$ obtains, with the normalization $\rho^{1/\beta-3/2}(z)$.

Finally, the value of β is chosen as an input. The choice $\beta = 2/3$ for both clusters and groups leads to the model of Evrard & Henry (1991), in which $L \propto T^{11/4}$ obtains, with constant normalization. The choice $\beta = 1$ leads to the somewhat different model of Kaiser (1991), in which $L \propto T^{3.5}$ obtains, with the normalization anti-evolving like $(1+z)^{-3/2}$; this will become even more negative when the evolution of ϕ is taken into account, so conflicting with the data of Mushotzky & Scharf (1997).

2.4. ICP models and cosmology

Shock and adiabatic models can be characterized in terms of entropy (see Bower 1997). Actually, the modes of entropy production and distribution correlate with the global dynamics.

Collapses, merging and the induced shocks are currently ongoing in the *critical* universe, so that strong shocks form close to the virial radius. Entropy is continuously generated in the outer regions, so that its radial distribution is raised outwards. Then the effective γ will be close to one, leading to a roughly flat $T(r)$ inside the shock. The density is determined by the boundary conditions after eqs. (4). Shocks are weaker in groups, the density profile is shallower, and the $L - T$ relation steeper.

Conversely, in an *open* universe most dynamical action is moved back to early times: merging and mixing occurred early on, and then subsided; shocks had time to expand beyond R and weaken; correspondingly, the accretion petered out under nearly adiabatic conditions for groups and for clusters as well. Then the effective γ is closer to $5/3$, and this may be used to roughly scale the central densities with different virial temperatures T to obtain $L \propto T^{3.5} R_X^3$. The two adiabatic models adopt additional, and different, assumptions concerning r_c or R_X , i.e., $r_c \propto T^{-0.25}$, or $R_X = \text{const}$, as discussed in §2.3.

For open cosmologies with $\Omega_0 \approx 0.5$, or for flat ones with $\Omega_\lambda = 1 - \Omega_0$, the present deceleration is *intermediate* between the two above cases, and the applicability of the shock or of the adiabatic model is not so clearcut; we shall consider both, finding similar results as is expected.

3. Statistics of condensations, and X-ray observables

We use the dark mass $m \equiv M/M_o$ normalized to the characteristic mass $M_o = 0.6 \cdot 10^{15} \Omega_0 h^{-1} M_\odot$ defined in the hierarchical clustering theory, see Appendix A and the analytical details given in Appendix C. The X-ray temperature T reads:

$$T = T_o m^{2/3} (1+z). \quad (6)$$

On the basis of §2, for the shock model the bolometric luminosity is given by

$$L = L_o \langle g^2(T) \rangle \overline{n^2(r)/n_2^2} (T/T_o)^2 (1+z); \quad (7)$$

the ratio $\overline{n^2(r)/n_2^2}$ (integrated over the cluster volume) and the factor $\langle g^2 \rangle$ (averaged over the merging histories) have been derived in §2.2.

The constant kT_o takes on the value $4.5 \Omega_0$ keV (see Appendix C). The luminosity L_o is calibrated on the height of the observed, local $L - T$ correlation (see fig. 2) rather than computed a priori, in view of the subtleties discussed in §5. At 4.5 keV we find $L_o = 1.6 (1 \pm 0.25) h^{-2} 10^{44}$ erg/s. The height of the local luminosity function provides an independent value for the normalization, which we find consistent with the former to within 15%.

The statistics at different z of DM halos in the HC theory is provided by the standard Press & Schechter (1974) formula, which in comoving form (ρ_o being the local cosmological density) reads:

$$N(m, z) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{\delta_c \rho_o}{M_o^2} \left| \frac{d \ln \sigma}{d \ln m} \right| \frac{m^{-2}}{\sigma(m) D(z)} e^{-\frac{\delta_c^2}{2 \sigma^2(m) D^2(z)}}, \quad (8)$$

where δ_c is the critical threshold for the collapses of the density perturbations (depending weakly on the cosmological parameters); on the other hand, $D(z)$ is the linear growth factor for the density perturbations, sensitively depending on the cosmological parameters (see Appendix A). The linear, time-evolved mass variance $\sigma(m) D(z)$ is usually represented in the form $\sigma_8 m^{-a} D(z)$ where $a \equiv (n_e + 3)/6$ contains the effective slope $n_e(M) \approx -1.3 \div -2$ of the power spectrum $\langle |\delta_k|^2 \rangle$ at scales $\sim 10 \div 1$ Mpc.

It is characteristic of eq. (9) to comprise two kinds of evolution: the number increase $\propto D^{-1}(z)$ at the low- M end, and the shift toward smaller M of the upper exponential cutoff. Such dynamical evolutions, modulated by cosmology, must combine with the ICP

evolution to yield closely constant luminosity functions as observed. We conservatively adopt the Press & Schechter rendition of the hierarchical clustering, keeping in mind its problems and limitations (see Bond et al. 1991, Cavaliere et al. 1993) and deferring discussions to §4.4 and 5.

From such statistics of dark halos using eq. (8) we compute the luminosity function $N(L) = N(M)dM/dL$, the expected flux counts $N(> F)$ of X-ray clusters, and their contribution to the soft XRB. The latter two observables read (see Appendix C)

$$N(> F) = R_H \int_{m_1}^{\infty} dm \int_{z_F}^{\infty} d\omega d\ell(z) N(m, z) dm , \quad (9)$$

$$I(\nu_o) = \int \int_{m_o}^{m_1} R_H d\ell(z) N(m) dm \overline{[n(r)/n_1]^2}$$

$$\frac{L_o m^{4/3} (1+z)^{5/2}}{4\pi \Gamma(0.6) k T_o m^{2/3}} \left[\frac{h\nu}{k T_o m^{2/3}} \right]^{-0.4} e^{-\frac{h\nu}{k T_o m^{2/3}}} . \quad (10)$$

Here the lower limit m_o is set by the requirement that $T(m, z) > 0.5$ keV, the effective lower bound for group temperatures from preheating; smaller masses would correspond to galaxies, where the amount of diffuse baryons and the emission (per unit total mass) drop sharply (Fabbiano 1996).

The limit m_1 in eq. (10) is set by the maximum between $T(m, z) > 0.5$ keV and the limiting flux of cluster or group sources, for which we conservatively adopt $4 \cdot 10^{-14}$ erg/s cm². On the other hand, m_1 also constitutes the upper limit for the the *unresolved* sources contributing to the XRB.

Thus a *complementarity* relationship holds between the counts and the contribution to the XRB. If one limits the number of resolved sources in the counts by assuming, e.g., a stricter surface brightness selection, as discussed later on, then all sources pronounced unresolved will contribute to the XRB. The joint consideration of these two observables is thus expected to give robust constraints.

4. Results

In the luminosity functions $N(L, z)$ the luminosities are reduced to the ROSAT band for comparison with the data. The derivation of the temperature function $N(T, z)$ involves only eqs. (9) and (7), corresponding to the mere *passive* role played here by the ICP.

The results depend on cosmology, and are sensitive to the values of the normalization L_o and of the amplitude σ_8 . To a weaker extent, they depend also on the full shape of the power spectrum, which is determined in turn by Ω_0 and (weakly) by Ω_B , but does *not* depend directly on Ω_λ (although its normalization does).

We note that L_o and σ_8 decrease with Ω_o decreasing, and by themselves tend to decrease all numbers; however, this is delicately balanced by the increase of the distances and by the slower (negative) evolution, as discussed in more detail in §4.4. With $\Omega_\lambda \neq 0$ the amplitude σ_8 is larger, and this also enters the results as discussed in §4.3.

As for the cosmological parameters, we conservatively adopt combinations of h and Ω_0 yielding for the present age of the universe $t_0 = 13 \pm 2$ Gyr (see Ostriker & Steinhardt 1995). On the other hand, many X-ray measurements in clusters give a considerable ratio $\approx 0.15 \div 0.20$ of the baryons to dark matter; as rich clusters are likely to constitute fair samples of the universe, an abundance ratio $\Omega_B/\Omega_0 = 0.05 \pm 0.02 h^{-3/2}$ is indicated (White et al. 1993; White & Fabian 1995; Markevitch et al. 1996). So for $\Omega_0 \approx 0.3$ a sufficient value $\Omega_B = 0.0125 \pm 0.0025 h^{-2}$ is predicted by the standard cosmological nucleosynthesis with canonical abundances of light elements (Walker et al. 1991); but in the critical case (with $h = 0.5$) this must be stretched up to $\Omega_B = 0.15 \div 0.20$.

The full $\sigma(m)$ for CDM cosmogonies in different cosmologies, normalized to the four-year COBE results (Gorsky et al. 1996), are given by Bunn & White (1996), and White et al. (1996). We focus on three popular CDM cosmologies/cosmogonies, which provide acceptable values for σ_8 : the tilted ($n_p = 0.8$) spectrum in a critical universe with high baryonic content (TCDM); the scale-invariant spectrum at large scales ($n_p = 1$) either in a flat universe with $\Omega_o = 0.3$ and $\Omega_\lambda = 0.7$ (Λ CDM), or in an open universe with $\Omega_o \approx 0.5$ (OCDM). In the last subsection, the full set of CDM cosmogonies will be discussed in a more synthetic way.

Our results will be compared with the data from two recent surveys with ROSAT: the relatively local Brightest Cluster Sample by Ebeling et al. 1997, and the higher z sample by Rosati et al. (1997).

4.1. Tilted CDM with high baryon content in the critical universe

For the TCDM, we adopt the tilted primordial spectral index $n_p = 0.8$ and the amplitude $\sigma_8 = 0.66 (1 \pm 0.08)$, with a high baryonic fraction $\Omega_B = 0.15$, in the critical universe with Hubble constant $h = 0.5$.

The tilt is chosen following White et al. (1996) so as to minimize one of the main problems of the Standard CDM, namely, the excess of small-scale power, still retaining a value for h rather low but still not inconsistent with current observations. In addition, such a cosmogony includes the high baryonic fraction referred to above. We recall that such parameter set is hard pressed in terms of the low value of $h \approx 0.5$, and of the primordial abundance implied for light elements, with that of He exceeding many recent measurements; the debate is still hot on the related issue of the D/H ratio, with recent signs of convergence, see Tytler, Fan & Burles (1996); Songaila, Wampller & Cowie (1997).

After §2.4 we consider here only the PE model with the full range of shock strengths. In fig. 3a we compare the *local* luminosity function with the current data; it is seen that an acceptable fit obtains only at the lower 2 standard deviations in σ_8 . It is also seen that the evolution of $N(L, z)$ is predicted to be virtually nil out to $z \approx 0.8$, consistent with data by Rosati et al. (1997).

The evolution of the temperature function is characterized by a fast decrease out to a moderate z in the number of high- T (massive) clusters. This is within the reach of SAX (Piro et al. 1997) and XMM (Mason et al. 1995), and is shown in fig. 3b.

The counts are shown in fig. 3c. The fit of the predicted counts to the bright data reflects the acceptability of the fit to the local luminosity function. Note that the slope of predicted counts is sufficiently *flat* to fit both the bright and the faint data by lowering σ_8 to within the COBE uncertainty. Alternatively, a similar result is obtained on using the central value of σ_8 from COBE, but the higher baryon abundance $\Omega_B/\Omega_0 = 0.20$.

Our computation of the soft XRB (see fig. 3d) comprises, as said above, the sources fainter than $2 \cdot 10^{-14}$ erg/s cm². Our predictions are compared with the residual XRB from ROSAT, once the AGNs contribution ($\approx 70\%$ at 1 keV, see Hasinger 1996) has been *subtracted* out. The computed curve lies below

the upper bounds.

4.2. Open CDM with $\Omega_o \approx 0.5$

As said, open universes with $\Omega_o \lesssim 0.3$ apparently constitute the simplest way out of the baryonic crisis. However, it is seen in fig. 4 that COBE-normalized cosmogonies with $\Omega_o \leq 0.4$ using the adiabatic model for the ICP, suffer from the fatal flaw of severely underpredicting both the local functions of temperature and luminosity. The blame stays mainly with the dynamical sectors; specifically, the low spectral amplitude σ_8 yields a severe deficit in $N(L, 0)$, and correspondingly a deficit in the bright counts. Similar dynamical reasons yield in aimed N-body simulations a percentage of complex morphologies lower than observed in the local clusters (West, Jones & Forman 1995; Mohr et al. 1995).

On the other hand, intermediate values of Ω_o are still a possibility. After Liddle et al. (1996), the range allowed to the class of open cosmologies by a set of observational constraints, including $h \geq 0.5$ and the COBE normalization, is narrowed down to vicinity of $\Omega_o \approx 0.5$. We focus first on the representative OCDM cosmogony, with $\Omega_o = 0.5$, $h = 0.65$ with $\Omega_B = 0.07$, which yield $\sigma_8 = 0.76 (1 \pm 0.08)$.

Here it is not easy to decide a priori whether the PE or the adiabatic model applies better to the ICP, so we use both, ending up in similar results as expected. These are shown in figs. 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d. It is seen that the local distributions are well fitted, but the integrated observables show excesses over the data.

These persist when other values of Ω_o around 0.5 are used, and when the uncertainties in σ_8 and L_o are considered, as discussed in §4.4.

4.3. CDM with $\Omega_o = 0.3$ in flat geometry

“Intermediate” conditions for the cosmic deceleration also obtain when $\Omega_\lambda \neq 0$ is accepted, with a flat geometry as in most variants of inflation. The values $\Omega_o = 0.3$ and $\Omega_\lambda = 0.7$, with $\Omega_B = 0.05$ and $h = 0.7$, match many observational evidences (see Ostriker & Steinhardt 1995). Following Klypin, Primack and Holtzman (1997), here the normalization is $\sigma_8 = 1.1 (1 \pm 0.08)$.

Here as in the previous case we have to consider both the PE and the adiabatic model. We show in fig. 6a and 6b the local luminosity and temperature functions, while in figs. 6c and 6d we plot the predicted counts and the contribution to the soft XRB.

4.4. A synthetic presentation

Here we give results covering the full set of COBE-normalized CDM cosmogonies. For a synthetic presentation, in figs. 7a and 7b we compare the predictions for the counts at bright ($F = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-11}$ erg/s cm²) and at faint fluxes ($F = 4 \cdot 10^{-14}$ erg/s cm²) with the data. We also show the effects of varying σ_8 within the uncertainty associated with COBE data, and L_o within the minimum dispersion intrinsic to the $L-T$ relation. Note in the figures that the strips corresponding to the uncertainties narrow down at the upper edge, because σ_8 (entering inversely the expression for $\Delta N/N$) increases with Ω_o . Similarly, $\Delta N/N$ is larger for the TCDM cosmogony compared with Standard CDM, due to the smaller value of σ_8 .

Our results agree with Liddle et al. (1996) in ruling out $\Omega_o < 0.45$ and $\Omega_o > 0.55$. Even in the remaining range our results compare critically with the data, because on fine-tuning Ω_o toward ≈ 0.4 the local luminosity function and the bright counts turn out to be underestimated; on the other hand, as soon as $\Omega_o \approx 0.5$ is approached, an acceptable fit to the local luminosity function is recovered, but an excess in the faint counts is generated (see fig. 5), especially with the adiabatic model. In summary, agreement with *both* the bright and the faint data is at best marginal; the underlying reason is that in open cosmologies long lines of sight and slow dynamical evolution conspire to yield a slope of the counts too *steep* to account for *both* faint and bright counts.

We note that such a slope would be even increased on considering that the formation z is always larger than z at observation, which has the affect of steepening, if only slightly, the luminosity functions (Cavaliere, Colafrancesco & Menci 1993; Kitayama & Suto 1997). Note also that the addition of $\Omega_\lambda = 0.7$ to $\Omega_o = 0.3$ implies a higher value of σ_8 and hence a higher levels of faint counts, though lower than in the $\Omega_o \approx 0.5$ case.

In figs. 7 we also show that the counts in TCDM critical and in Λ CDM cosmogonies/cosmologies can be made consistent with the observations on considering not only their uncertainties, but also those in the present COBE normalization and the intrinsic uncertainty in the $L-T$ relation, see the discussion following eq. (7).

Overall, a common feature of all the above models based on canonical hierarchical clustering, is constituted by some *excess* in the counts; only in the crit-

ical and in the flat geometry this can be brought to consistency with the data. This may indicate some non-trivial incompleteness in the canonical hierarchical clustering, worth keeping under scrutiny.

We also show in fig. 8 the results for the contribution to the soft XRB, e.g., at $E \approx 1$ keV. Once again, CDM with $0.55 < \Omega_o \leq 1$ is ruled out, while $\Omega_o \approx 0.5$ is marginal also in this respect.

Could excess faint counts be reduced by considering a stronger selection due to surface brightness? On the contrary, we stress that the complementarity with the contribution to XRB makes any such excess even more significant. In fact, a solution cannot be sought in terms of surface brightness selections without increasing the excess contribution to the XRB from the unresolved groups and clusters.

5. Conclusions and discussion

In this paper we have computed the X-ray observables for groups and clusters of galaxies. As anticipated in the Introduction, we use – rather than continuous and possibly degenerate parametrizations – only discrete combinations of *physical* models appropriate for the Dark Matter and for the Intra-Cluster Plasma.

We first list our results, and then discuss them in detail.

We have developed the punctuated equilibria (PE) model for the ICP state and dynamics. This is comprised of the following two components.

As for *single* clusters, we have used a polytropic β -model which yields temperature profile $T(r)$ (see fig. 1) in good agreement with the observations. We predict the ICP density profile $n(r)$ and the brightness profile to be flatter for groups than for clusters, corresponding to a larger extension of the ICP relatively to their gravitational radii.

As for *statistics*, we convolved the ICP equilibria with the histories of DM halos, and predicted the $L-T$ correlation to take the form shown in fig. 2, in agreement with the data. In addition, we predicted an *intrinsic* variance with the minimum value also represented in fig. 2.

Based on our PE model we then proceeded to compute for various standard cosmological frameworks the local and the evolved *luminosity functions* of galaxy clusters, that we compared with the data (fig. 3a, 4, 5a, 6a). We derived also the number counts

(fig. 3c, 5c, 6c), the z -distributions (fig. 9) and the contribution to the soft X-ray background (fig. 3d, 5d, 6d). Our results are summarized in figs. 7a and 7b; these show that the set of acceptable cosmologies/cosmologies is restricted to three disjoint *domains*: $0.4 < \Omega_o < 0.5$ for the standard CDM; $\Omega = 1$ for the Tilted CDM; $\Omega_o \approx 0.3$ for CDM in flat geometry. In fig. 9 we summarize the *confidence* levels at which the data are matched.

We next proceed to discuss in detail the results listed above.

5.1. ICP state in evolving DM halos

The ICP *state* in the hierarchically evolving gravitational wells constitutes the focus of our new approach. We propose that such state follows suit, passing through a sequence of *punctuated equilibria* (PE) that we compute semi-analytically. These computations comprise: the merging histories of the DM potential wells, obtained with a large statistics from Monte Carlo simulations of the hierarchical clustering; the inner *hydrostatic* equilibrium disposition, updated after each merging episode; and the *boundary* conditions provided by strong and weak shocks, or even by a closely adiabatic compression, depending on the ratio of the infall to the thermal energy in the preheated external medium.

The results of our model depend on two parameters, the external temperature T_1 and density n_1 , which are *not* free. Specifically, we use for T_1 the lower bound $T_{1\ell} = 0.5$ keV provided by the literature on stellar preheating; in the merging events the effective T_1 is the virial temperature of the incoming clumps, when this is larger than 0.5 keV. The value of n_1 for rich clusters is related to the DM density by the universal baryonic fraction $\Omega_B \approx 0.15$.

Note that our PE model does not require strict spherical symmetry, but rather that the residual internal velocities be smaller than the inflow velocity. So they can include merging episodes ranging from nearly isotropic accretion of small clumps and diffuse gas, to anisotropic coalescence of comparable clumps along filaments of the large scale structures.

The expression of the bolometric luminosity is proportional to $g^2 = (n_2/n_1)^2$, the square of the density jump at the bounding shock. The average of such factor over the merging histories is what gives to the statistical $L - T$ correlation the *curved* shape shown in fig. 2. For rich clusters we obtain $L \propto T^3$. This

flattens to $L \propto T^2$ for larger T , corresponding to the saturation of the shock compression factor, i.e., $g(T/T_1) \rightarrow 4$ when $T \gg T_1$. At the other end, the correlation steepens to $L \propto T^5$ in the group range, where $T/T_1 \sim 1$ and the shocks are substantially weakened by the preheating temperature in the infalling clumps. The amplitude of the $L - T$ correlation rises gently proportionally to $(1+z) \propto \rho_1(z)^{1/2}$ where ρ_1 is the density in the large scale structures hosting clusters and groups.

In addition, our PE approach predicts an intrinsic *variance* of dynamical origin due to the different merging histories, and built in the factor g^2 . Such variance constitutes a lower bound, in view of additional contributions from the variance in the ambient density, and from the central luminosity associated with cooling flows (Fabian et al. 1994; White, Jones & Forman 1997).

5.2. Contact with hydrodynamical simulations and with observations

The PE model includes, in a simplified semi-analytical form, compression and shocks at the boundary with the surrounding environment, which is modulated in density by the large scale structure and in temperature by the stellar preheating.

Simulations now clearly show the *shocks* occurring also in major merging events (Schindler & Mueller 1993; Roettiger, Stone & Mushotzky 1997). The inclusion of the Rankine-Hugoniot conditions rises the internal temperature at the expenses of the inflow velocities. Complex features are found like residual kinetic pressures, and unmixed hot spots in the temperature distribution; but over times of about 2 Gyr the residual kinetic pressure over cluster scales reduces to less than 20 % of the thermal one.

On the other hand, in the hierarchical clustering such major events are rare; our Monte Carlo simulations give a probability $\lesssim 20\%$ for very asymmetric events with mass ratios 2:1 or larger occurring within 2 Gyr from the cluster observation. In addition, in such events the ICP temperature in the infalling sub-cluster is comparable to the virial value in the main cluster. Such major events with their low frequency and large T_1 yield a minor contribution to the *statistical* $\langle (n_2/n_1)^2 \rangle$.

Our semi-analytical model describes only crudely these transient if conspicuous features, to focus on the lesser and more symmetric events which contribute

the most to the $L - T$ relation. At the extreme of spherical accretion of loose gas the simulations (see Takizawa & Mineshige 1997) show in detail that *shocks* also form and expand slowly, to leave inside a declining temperature profile and a steeper density profile.

Our PE model yields temperature profiles *decreasing* as shown in fig. 1. These agree with the published data (see Hughes et al. 1988; Honda et al. 1997; Markevitch et al. 1997); they agree also with the results from state-of-the-art simulations (Bryan & Norman 1997) obtained by running on supercomputers advanced 3D Eulerian codes with adapting mesh and reliable shock capturing methods. While the high-resolution simulations are limited (for now and for some time to come) to the condition of no stellar preheating suitable only for very rich clusters, our model includes the effects of stellar preheating of the outer gas over the whole range from groups to clusters.

5.3. Constraining cosmology

With the ICP state so described, we proceeded to constrain the cosmological parameters. After the observations by Rosati et al. (1997), the main rule of the game turns out to be as follows: the dynamical evolution contained in the standard Press & Schechter formula (eq. 9) must *combine* with the evolution of the $L - T$ correlation and with cosmology to yield closely non-evolutionary $N(L, z)$.

We stress that such combinations are severely selected in our approach. In fact, strong *shocks* are common in the *critical* cosmology, where accretion and merging activity are currently ongoing, and there *shocks* apply in full; these include also weak shocks for small groups with virial temperatures below 1 keV, and for those rich clusters which merge with comparable clumps. Closely *adiabatic* compressions, instead, prevail for all structures in very *open* universes with high formation redshifts, and little or no strong shocks and mixing at present. This defines the domain of applicability of the two adiabatic models by Kaiser (1991) and Evrard & Henry (1991).

In detail, our results are as follows (see fig. 7).

We confirm that Standard CDM in the *critical* cosmology is definitely ruled out on account of its overproduction of local clusters and of their considerable positive evolution.

We also rule out *open* cosmologies with $\Omega_o \leq 0.3$, the simplest way to enforce little evolution and also

to provide a solution to the baryonic crisis. In fact, these cosmologies when COBE-normalized yield a severe deficit in the local luminosity function and in the source counts.

Thus, we investigated more *elaborate* solutions: the critical universe with tilted CDM and a high baryon content; and two cases of intermediate deceleration, comprising CDM with canonical nucleosynthesis either in mildly open universes with $\Omega_o \approx 0.5$, or in flat geometry with $\Omega_o = 0.3$ and $\Omega_\lambda = 0.7$.

With the first solution we obtain (marginally) acceptable results (see figs. 3a-3c) for the local luminosity function $N(L, 0)$, for the source counts, and for the contribution to the soft XRB, within the present uncertainties of the data and within the variance intrinsic to the theory. We note that the cosmological/cosmogonical sectors by themselves may be tested independently, based on the fast evolution with z (see fig. 3b) of the temperature distribution in the critical case, as pointed out by many authors (see Oukbir & Blanchard 1992; Henry 1997); this constitutes an important program for the satellites SAX and XMM

As for cosmologies with *intermediate* deceleration, here neither the PE nor the adiabatic models for the ICP are cogently indicated; thus we considered both, obtaining generally similar results as expected. For open cosmologies in particular, the results are inconsistent with the observations of the local luminosity function and of the counts, except for the range $\Omega_o = 0.45 \div 0.55$; even there the counts are excessive at more than the formal 99% confidence level (see fig. 9), the excess being larger for the adiabatic models. The excess is due to built-in reasons, that is, the relative large amplitude σ_8 and the relatively steep shape of the counts, as spelled out in §4.4. Instead, in the $\Omega_o + \Omega_\lambda = 1$ cosmology a manageable count excess is obtained.

We note that the Kaiser's (1991) variant of the adiabatic models does not yield such an excess for $\Omega_o \approx 0.5$, due to its normalization decreasing at high z . However, the local luminosity function computed from this model overestimates the number of brightest clusters, due to the strong dependence $L \propto T^{3.5}$. Moreover, the normalization decrease at high z is hardly consistent with the data by Mushotzky and Scharf (1997). Finally, it yields a fast, negative evolution of $N(L, z)$ barely consistent with the data in the survey by Rosati et al. (1997) (the deficit is truly fatal in the critical or in the flat cosmology). As luminosities larger than some $3 \cdot 10^{44}$ erg sec⁻¹ are little repre-

sented in that survey, a strong test for such a negative evolution concerns any deficit at bright fluxes in the redshift distribution from a large-area survey. So we show in fig. 10 the redshift distribution computed also for this model.

We have conservatively chosen to focus on a limiting flux $F = 4 \cdot 10^{-14}$ erg sec $^{-1}$ for which the sky coverage is nearly 100% (P. Rosati, private communication), and any incompleteness is out of question. Incompleteness due to surface brightness may be relevant at fainter fluxes, depending on the cluster and group profiles. We plan to treat such issue elsewhere, but here we point out that in our approach the impact of any such incompleteness is limited by the *complementarity* between counts of resolved sources and contribution to the XRB from the rest.

Our summary is that many combinations of standard cosmogonies/cosmologies with ICP models are ruled out. A relatively *small* set of disjoint cosmologies/cosmogonies survive, as shown by fig. 7: $\Omega = 1$ with tilted CDM and high baryonic abundance combined with the Punctuated Equilibria, which is marginally consistent with the data; CDM in open cosmology with $0.5 < \Omega_o < 0.55$, which is barely consistent using the PE, and even less so using the adiabatic models; CDM with $\Omega_o = 0.3$ and $\Omega_\lambda = 0.7$, which is consistent using either the PE and the adiabatic models.

So cosmological parameters can be constrained on the basis of X-ray clusters, but only *up to a point*; for example, the residual uncertainty in the density parameter is $\Delta\Omega_o/\Omega_o > 20\%$.

5.4. What next

To what extent enlarging the data base on X-ray clusters will help in further constraining cosmology? Here we argue that the variance intrinsic to the hierarchical clustering, and amplified by the ICP emissivity, sets an effective *limitation*. In fact, fig. 7 shows that the present Poissonian error bars in the observed faint counts are already smaller than the (minimum) intrinsic variance in the predicted ones. Decreasing the former with richer, faint surveys will hardly provide a sharper insight into cosmology unless one reduces both the uncertainty concerning σ_8 and the larger one concerning L_o ; in fact, the two enter with comparable weights eq. (10), since it is seen that $\Delta\sigma_8/\sigma_8$ acts roughly as $(n_e + 3)\Delta L_o/6L_o \approx 0.2\Delta L_o/L_o$.

To what point are these reductions feasible? On

the theoretical side, the minimum $\Delta L_o/L_o$ of dynamical origin may be sharpened by Monte Carlo simulations so extensive as to provide the full scatter distribution. But then one must tackle also the enhanced emissivity produced or signaled by cooling flows, correlated with higher ambient densities; this we shall treat elsewhere (Cavaliere Menci & Tozzi, in preparation).

On the observational side, one needs a large statistics for the distributions of L and T ; this will help in deriving narrower $L - T$ correlations for subsamples categorized in term of mass deposition rates from cooling flows, see White, Forman & Jones (1997). Such aim calls for spectroscopic measurements of T , which are obviously harder than the bolometric L , and require SAX or even XMM. However, we stress that such efforts will find soon a more *proper* aim than constraining Ω_o .

This is because soon MAP (Bennett et al. 1997), and subsequently PLANCK (Bersanelli et al. 1996), will accurately measure on very large and still linear scales not only the perturbation power spectrum (from which σ_8 is derived), but also directly Ω_o to better than 10%; this will supersede constraints set at cluster scales gone *non-linear*.

Once the cosmological framework has been fixed, the study of groups and clusters in X-rays will resume what we submit to be its proper course; that is, the physics of systems of intermediate *complexity* which is comprised of the DM and of the ICP component.

With the latter fully understood and the scatter in the $L - T$ relation assessed, cluster X-raying will finally expose the underlying process of *non-linear* condensation of DM on scales 1–10 Mpc. Then any mismatch concerning the number counts or $N(L, z)$ will be telling of failures either in the CDM spectra or in the current representation of cosmogony in terms of the Press & Schechter formula.

As a relevant example, we recall from §4.4 that even the acceptable models we computed tend to exceed the observed faint counts, and can be brought to consistency only at the lower end of the current uncertainty concerning σ_8 . On the other hand, the corrections to the Press & Schechter formula currently discussed yield a larger number of clusters. For example, Jain & Bertschinger (1995), and Gardner, Tozzi & Governato (1998) find that the threshold δ_c must be lowered from the canonical value 1.69 to 1.5, at least at $z \geq 1$ if not already at $z = 0$; a similar trend

obtains considering that the formation redshift is always greater than the observation's as discussed in §4.4. If MAP will provide definite values of n_p , σ_8 and Ω_o such as to enhance the excess in the faint counts, then the Press & Schechter rendition of the non-linear cosmogony will have to be reconsidered.

Preliminary computations of the source counts and the contribution to the soft X-ray background have been performed by F. Lupini in his Thesis. We are indebted with P. Rosati for communicating his data prior to publication and for many informations. We thank S. De Grandi, C. Gheller, M. Girardi, S. Molendi, L. Moscardini, O. Pantano and D. Trevese for helpful discussions. We also thank our referee M. Henriksen for several helpful comments, and for stimulating us to better focus our exposition. Partial grants are acknowledged from MURST and ASI.

A. Standard hierarchical clustering

We recall that the variance of the perturbation field at a scale $R = 2\pi/k$ (associated to the mass scale $M = \bar{\rho} 4\pi R^3/3$ in terms of the average density $\bar{\rho}$) is defined by

$$\sigma^2(R) = \frac{1}{V} \int d^3k |\delta_k|^2 W(kR), \quad (A1)$$

where $W(kR)$ is a top-hat filter (see Bond et al. 1991; Lacey & Cole 1993). This is given in terms of the power spectrum $|\delta_k|^2 = k^{n_p} T^2(k)$ which depends on the physics of the early Universe (see Peebles 1993; Lucchin, Matarrese and Mollerach 1992) and by the subsequent microphysics.

Results from the COBE/DMR experiment give $n_p \approx 1 \pm 0.2$ and provide the normalization on large-angle scales (see Bunn & White 1996 and references therein). The transfer function $T(k)$ depends on the nature of DM which is the main constituent of the perturbations; for CDM, and given values of the parameters Ω_o , h and Ω_B , standard formulae are given, e.g., by Sugiyama (1995); White et al. (1996). These can be recast into the form $\sigma(m) = \sigma_8 m^{-a}$, where $a \equiv (n_e + 3)/6$, with n_e being the effective, scale depending, index in the full power spectrum $\langle |\delta_k|^2 \rangle$. The values of the amplitude at $8 h^{-1}$ Mpc are given, e.g., by Bennett et al. (1996) for different cosmologies.

The scale $8 h^{-1}$ Mpc also defines a characteristic

mass

$$M_o = \frac{4\pi}{3} \rho_o (8 h^{-1} \text{Mpc})^3 = 0.6 \cdot 10^{15} \Omega_o h^{-1} M_\odot, \quad (A2)$$

which we shall use as our unit mass.

At any given mass scale, the time evolution is derived from the linear growth of the perturbations $D(t)$ (see Peebles 1993), which depends both on the density parameter Ω_o and on the parameter $\Omega_\lambda = \Lambda/3 H_o^2$ associated to the cosmological constant Λ . An expression valid in all cases with $\Omega_o + \Omega_\lambda = 1$ (as predicted by most inflationary models) is given by Lupini (1996) in terms of the epoch t , and writes

$$D(t) = \left[\frac{1 + 3 \frac{\Omega_\lambda}{\Omega_o} \alpha^2}{\frac{t^2}{t_o^2} + 3 \frac{\Omega_\lambda}{\Omega_o} \alpha^2} \right]^{1/3}, \quad (A3)$$

where t_o is the present epoch, and $\alpha \equiv 2\Omega_o^{1/2}/\pi H_o t_o$. For $\Omega = 1$ the one obtains $D(z) = (1+z)^{-1}$.

The mass distribution $N(M, z)$ of the condensations given in eq. (9) has been derived by Press & Schechter (1974), and is discussed by Bond et al. (1991). Here we stress that it contains only the linear mass variance $\sigma(m)$ and the threshold for non-linear collapse δ_c for which the canonical value 1.69 is taken.

B. Postshock conditions, and polytropic equilibrium

The jump conditions at the shocks are based on the Rankine-Hugoniot conservations, and may be obtained from the implicit expressions given, e.g., by Landau & Lifshitz (1959). We work out the explicit expression of the post-shock temperature T_2 for three degrees of freedom and for a nearly static post-shock condition with $v_2 \ll v_1$, in the form:

$$kT_2 = \frac{\mu m_H v_1^2}{3} \left[\frac{(1 + \sqrt{1 + \epsilon})^2}{4} + \frac{7}{10} \epsilon - \frac{3}{20} \frac{\epsilon^2}{(1 + \sqrt{1 + \epsilon})^2} \right], \quad (B1)$$

where $\epsilon \equiv 15kT_1/4\mu m_H v_1^2$. In a ‘‘cold inflow’’ with $\epsilon \ll 1$ the shock is strong, and the expression simplifies to $kT_2 \simeq \mu m_H v_1^2/3 + 3kT_1/2$. The flow velocity v_1 is set by the potential drop across the region of nearly free fall, to read $v_1^2 \simeq -1.4 \phi_2/m_H$ where ϕ_2 is the potential at $r = R$ (see CMT97). Since $1.4 \mu \approx 1$, the above equation may be effectively approximated by $kT_2 \simeq -\phi/3 + 3kT_1/2$ ¹. Instead, for $\epsilon \gg 1$ the

¹We correct here a numerical error in eq. (3) of CMT97, where $7/8$ appeared instead of $3/2$.

shock is weak and $T_2 \simeq T_1$ is recovered as expected.

When the temperature profile is polytropic with $T(r) \propto n(r)^{\gamma-1}$, eq. (2) is modified to

$$L \propto T^2 \rho^{1/2} \left[\frac{T_2}{T} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{[n(r)/n_2]^{2+(\gamma-1)/2}} \quad (\text{B2})$$

The ratio $n(r)/n_2$ is obtained starting from the hydrostatic equilibrium $dP/n dr = -d\phi/dr$ with the polytropic pressure $P(r) = kT_2 n_2 [n(r)/n_2]^\gamma / \mu$. This yields (see Cavaliere & Fusco Femiano 1978; Sarazin 1988) the profiles

$$\frac{T(r)}{T_2} = \left[\frac{n(r)}{n_2} \right]^{\gamma-1} = 1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} \beta [\tilde{\phi}_2 - \tilde{\phi}(r)] , \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $\tilde{\phi} \equiv \phi/\mu m_H \sigma^2$ is the normalized potential; we use for $\phi(r)$ and $\sigma(r)$ the forms given by Navarro, Frenk & White (1996).

Eq. (B2) reduces to eq. (2) of the text in the isothermal limit when $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ and $T = T_2$. The volume-averaged factor in eq. (B2) differs from that for the isothermal case by less than 20% in the full range $1 < \gamma \leq 5/3$.

C. Luminosity functions and their integrals

The X-ray emission of clusters of galaxies is due to optically thin, thermal bremsstrahlung of the hot ($T \sim 10^{7-8}$ K) ICP in equilibrium with the cluster potential wells (Cavaliere, Gursky & Tucker 1971; see Sarazin 1988 for a review).

The virial theorem provides $T \propto M/R$. The virial radius R can be expressed in terms of the cluster mass M and the density ρ to read $R \propto (M/\rho)^{1/3}$, which yields $T \propto M^{2/3} \rho^{1/3}$. According to the standard hierarchical clustering, the DM density inside clusters is proportional to the background's, so that $\rho \approx 200\bar{\rho} \propto (1+z)^3$; then one obtains

$$T \propto M^{2/3} (1+z) , \quad (\text{C1})$$

corresponding to eq. (7) in the text. The proportionality factors in eq. (C1) are given, e.g., by Hjorth, Oukbir & van Kampen (1997) to imply $T = 4.5$ keV for a cluster with $M = M_{co}$.

The bremsstrahlung spectrum $\ell(\nu)$ at the frequency ν (in the frame of the source) is given by

$$\ell(\nu) \propto \int_V d^3r n^2(r) \frac{e^{-h\nu/kT}}{\sqrt{kT}} G_f(h\nu/kT) , \quad (\text{C2})$$

where n is the ICP density, V is the volume of the emission region and G_f is the Gaunt factor, which may be effectively approximated with the function $(h\nu/kT)^{-0.4}$. From eq. (C1) and (C2) one obtains in terms of the observed frequency $\nu_o = \nu/(1+z)$

$$\ell(\nu_o) = \frac{L}{4\pi\Gamma(0.6)} \left[\frac{h\nu_o}{kT_{co} m^{2/3}} \right]^{-0.4} e^{-\frac{h\nu_o}{kT_{co} m^{2/3}}} \frac{h}{kT_{co} m^{2/3}} . \quad (\text{C3})$$

Here L is the bolometric luminosity

$$L = L_o \overline{[n(r)/n_1]^2} m^{4/3} (1+z)^{7/2} , \quad (\text{C4})$$

where $\overline{[n(r)/n_1]^2} \equiv \int_0^R d^3r [n(r)/n_1]^2 / R^3$, and $L_o = 1.6 \cdot 10^{44} h^{-2} \text{ erg/s}$ corresponds to 4.5 keV calibrated to the local $L-T$ correlation. For comparison with ROSAT data, eq. (C3) is to be integrated over the local range $\Delta E = 0.5 \div 2$ keV. The resulting luminosity in the band ΔE reads $L_{\Delta E}(m, z) = w(\Delta E, m, z) L(m, z)$, where the correction factor is

$$w(\Delta E, m, z) = \int_{E_1(1+z)}^{E_2(1+z)} dE e^{-E/kT(m, z)} G_f(E/kT(m, z)) \quad (\text{C5})$$

The integral number counts are given by

$$N(> F) = \int dz dV(z) \int_{m_1}^{\infty} dm N(m, z) , \quad (\text{C6})$$

where $dV = R_H d\omega d\ell(z) D_L^2(z)/(1+z)^4$ is the cosmological volume subtended by the solid angle $d\omega$, $D_L(z)$ is the luminosity distance, and $R_H d\ell(z)$ is the line-of-sight element depending on Ω_o and Ω_λ . The lower mass m_1 is that corresponding (after eq. C4 and C5) to the lowest luminosity $L_{\Delta E}$ detectable, at any z , by a survey with the limiting flux F .

The complementary contribution to the soft XRB of the sources with $F' < F$ is given by the expression

$$I(\nu_o) = \int dV(z) \int_{m_o}^{m_1} dm \ell(\nu_o) \frac{N(m, z)}{4\pi D_L^2(z)} . \quad (\text{C7})$$

With the use of equation (C3) this yields the equation 11 of the text, where the limits m_o and m_1 are discussed.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, C.L. et al. 1996, COBE preprint, astro-ph/9601067
 Bennet, C.L. 1997, MAP experiment home page, URL <http://map.gsfc.nasa.gov>

- Bersanelli, M. et al. 1996, *COBRAS/SAMBA Report on the Phase A Study*, ESA D/SCI(96)3.
- Blanchard, A., Valls-Gabaud, D., & Mamon, G. 1992, *A&A*, 264, 365
- Bond, J.R., Cole, S., Efstathiou, G., & Kaiser, N. 1991, *ApJ* 379, 440
- Borgani, S., Rosati, P., Tozzi, P., & Norman, C. 1998, *ApJ* submitted
- Bower, R. 1997, *MNRAS*, 288, 355
- Bryan, G.L., & Norman, M.L. 1997, preprint [astro-ph/9710107]
- Bunn, E.F., & White, M., 1996, *ApJ*, 480, 6
- Cavaliere, A., Gurski, H., & Tucker, W.H. 1971, *Nature*, 231, 437
- Cavaliere, A., & Fusco Femiano, R. 1976, *A&A*, 49, 137
 ———— 1978, *A&A*, 70, 677
- Cavaliere, A., & Colafrancesco, S. 1988, *ApJ*, 331, 660
- Cavaliere, A., Menci, N., 1997, *ApJ*, 480, 132
- Cavaliere, A., Colafrancesco, S., & Menci, N. 1993, *ApJ*, 415, 50
- Cavaliere, A., Menci, N., Tozzi, P., 1997, *ApJL* 484, 1 (CMT97)
- Ciotti, L., D’Ercole, A., Pellegrini, S., & Renzini, A. 1991, *ApJ*, 376, 380
- Cole, S., Weimberg, D.H., Frenk, C.S., Ratra, B. 1997, *MNRAS*, in press [astro-ph/9702082]
- Collins, C.A., Burke, D.J., Romer, A.K., Sharpless, R.M., Nichol, R.C. 1997, *ApJ*, in press
- David, L.P., Slyz, A., Jones, C., Forman, W., Vrtillek, S.D., & Arnaud, K.A. 1993, *ApJ*, 412, 479
- David, L.P., Jones, C., & Forman, W. 1995, *ApJ*, 445, 578
- De Grandi, S., 1996, in MPE report 263, “Röntgenstrahlung from the Universe,” eds. H.U. Zimmermann, J. Trümper, H. Yorke, p. 577
- Ebeling, H., Edge, A.C., Fabian, A.C., Allen, S.W., Crawford, C.S., & Böhringer, H. 1997, preprint [astro-ph/9701179]
- Edge, A.C., & Stewart, G.C. 1991, *MNRAS*, 252, 428
- Evrard, A.E., Henry, J.P. 1991, *ApJ*, 383, 95
- Fabbiano, G., 1996, *AAS*, 188, 3103
- Gorski, K.M., Ratra, B., Stompor, R., Sugiyama, N., & Banday 1996, *ApJ*, in press [astro-ph/9608054]
- Gardner, Tozzi, P., Governato, F., 1998, in preparation
- Hasinger, G. 1996, *A&AS*, 120, 607
- Henriksen, M.J., & Markevitch, M.L. 1996, *ApJ*, 472, 17
- Henriksen, M.J., & White, R.E. III 1996, *ApJ*, 465, 515
- Henry, J.P., Arnaud, K.A., 1991, *ApJ* 372, 410
- Henry, J.P., Gioia, I.M., Maccacaro, T.M., Morris, S.L., Stocke, J. T., Wolter, A. 1992, *ApJ* 386, 408
- Henry, J.P. 1997, *ApJ*, 489, L1
- Hjorth, J., Oukbir, J., & van Kampen, E. 1997, preprint
- Honda, H., Hirayama, M., Watanabe, M., Yamashita, K., & Ohashi, T. 1997, in *X-ray Imaging and Spectroscopy of Cosmic Hot Plasmas* (Tokyo, Univ. Acad. Press), p. 111
- Hughes, J.P., Gorenstein, P., & Fabricant, D. 1988, *ApJ*, 239, 82
- Jain, B., & Bertschinger, E. 1995, *ApJ*, 431, 495
- Jones, C., David, L., Forman, W., Churazov, E., & Gilfanov, M. 1997, to appear in *Galactic and Cluster Cooling Flows*, ed. N. Socker
- Kaiser, N. 1986, *MNRAS*, 222, 323
- Kaiser, N. 1991, *ApJ*, 383, 104
- Klypin, A., Primack, J.R., & Holtzman, J., 1996, *ApJ*, in press
- Kitayama, T., & Suto, Y., *ApJ*, in press [astro-ph/9792017]
- Lacey, C., & Cole, S. 1993, *MNRAS*, 262, 627
- Landau, L.D., Lifshitz, E.M., 1959, *Fluid Mechanics* (London, Pergamon Press), p. 329, 331
- Liddle, A.R., Lyth, D.H., Roberts, D., & Viana, P.T.P. 1996, *MNRAS*, 278, 644
- Lucchin, F., Matarrese, S., & Mollerach, S. 1992, *ApJ*, 401, L49
- Lupini, F. 1996, Thesis, II University of Rome
- Markevitch, M., Mushotzky, R., Inoue, H., Yamashita, K., Furuzawa, A., Tawara, Y. 1996, *ApJ*, 456, 437
- Markevitch, M., Sarazin, C.L., & Henriksen, M.J. 1997, in *X-ray Imaging and Spectroscopy of Cosmic Hot Plasmas* (Tokyo, Univ. Acad. Press), p. 91

- Mason, K.O., Bignami, G., Brinkman, A.C., & Peacock, A. 1995, *Advances in Space Research*, 16, 41
- Mathiesen, B., & Evrard, A.E. 1997, *MNRAS*, in press [astro-ph/9703176]
- Mohr, J.J., Evrard, A.E., Fabricant, D.G., Geller, M.J. 1995 *ApJ* 447, 8
- Mushotzky, R.F. 1994, in *Clusters of Galaxies*, eds. F. Durret, A. Mazure, Tran Tahn Van J. (Gif-sur-Yvette: Ed. Frontières), 177
- Mushotzky, R.F., & Scharf, C.A. 1997, *ApJ*, 482, 13
- Navarro, J.F., Frenk, C.S., & White, S.D.M. 1996, *ApJ*, 462, 563
- Nichol, R.C., Holden, B.P., Romer, A.K., Ulmer, M.P., Burke, D.J., & Collins, C.A. 1997, *ApJ*, 481, 644
- Ostriker, J.P., & Steinhardt, P.J. 1995, *Nature*, 377, 600
- Oukbir, J., Blanchard, A. 1992, *A&A*, 252, L21
- Oukbir, J., Bartlett, J.G., Blanchard, A. 1997, *A&A*, 320, 365
- Peebles, P.J.E. 1993, *Principles of Physical Cosmology* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press)
- Perrenod, S.C. 1980, *ApJ*, 236, 373
- Piccinotti, G., Mushotzky, R.F., Boldt, E.A., Holt, S.S., Marshall, F.E., Serlemitsos, P.J., & Shafer, R.A. 1982, *ApJ*, 253, 485
- Piro, L. et al., 1995, in *X-ray and EUV/FUV Spectroscopy and Polarimetry*, ed. S. Fineschi, SPIE, 2517, 169
- Ponman, T.J., Bourner, P.D.J., Ebeling, H., Böhringer, H. 1996, *MNRAS*, 283, 690
- Press, W.H., & Schechter, P. 1974, *ApJ*, 187, 425
- Ramella, M., Geller, M.J., & Huchra, J.P. 1992, *ApJ*, 384, 396
- Renzini, A. 1997, preprint
- Roettiger, K., Stone, J.M., & Mushotzky, R.F. 1997, preprint [astro-ph/9708043]
- Rosati, P., Della Ceca, R., Norman, C., & Giacconi, R. 1997, preprint
- Sarazin, C.L. 1988, *X-ray Emission from Clusters of Galaxies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Sarazin, C.L. 1997, in *Galactic and Cluster Cooling Flows*, ed. N. Soker (San Francisco: PASP)
- Schindler, S., & Mueller, E. 1993, *A&A*, 272, 137
- Squires, G., & Kaiser, N. 1996, *ApJ*, 473, 65
- Songaila, A., Wampler, E.J., & Cowie, L.L. 1997, *Nature*, 385, 137
- Sugiyama, N. 1995, *ApJS*, 100, 281
- Takizawa, M., & Mineshige, S. 1997, preprint [astro-ph/9702047]
- Tormen, G. 1997, *MNRAS*, in press [astro-ph/9611078]
- Trinchieri, G., Fabbiano, G., Kim, D.W. 1997, *A&A* 318, 316
- Tsuru, T. et al. 1996, in *The 11th Int. Coll. on UV and X-ray Spectroscopy of Astrophysical and Laboratory Plasmas*, eds. Watanabe, T., Yamashita, K., in press
- Tytler, D., Fan, X.-M., Burles, S. 1996, San Diego preprint, astro-ph/9602050
- Walker, T., Steigman, G., Schramm, D.N., Olive, K.A., & Kang, H.S. 1991, *ApJ*, 376, 51
- West, M.J., Jones, C., Forma, W. 1995, *ApJL*, 451, 5
- White, D.A., Jones, C., & Forman, W. 1997, preprint, astro-ph/9707269
- White, S.D.M., & Rees, M. 1978, *MNRAS*, 183, 341
- White, S.D.M., Navarro, J.F., Frenk, C.S., & Evrard, A.E. 1993, *Nature*, 366, 429
- White, S.D.M., & Fabian, A.C. 1995, *MNRAS*, 273, 72
- White, M., Viana, P.T.P., Liddle, A.R., & Scott, D. 1996, *MNRAS*, 283, 107
- Zabludoff, H.I. & Zaritsky, D. 1995, *ApJ*, 447, L21

Fig. 1.— Temperature (top panel) and density (bottom panel) profiles for a single cluster of $10^{15} M_{\odot}$ at $z = 0$ in polytropic equilibrium; $\gamma = 1$ (solid line), 1.1 (dotted) and 1.2 (dashed), see eq. (B3); the dark matter potential is taken from Navarro, Frenk & White (1996), and critical cosmology with TCDM perturbation spectrum is used. The shock strength corresponds to $T_2/T_1 = 10$. The temperature is emission-weighted along the line of sight, and smoothed with a filter width of 100 kpc.

Fig. 2.— For the PE model and the TCDM cosmogony, we show the average $L - T$ relation (in terms of the emission temperatures) with its $2 - \sigma$ dispersion (shaded region). The average and the scatter of the compression factor are computed by convolving g^2 in eq. (4) with the merging histories. The steepening at low T is due to the preheating temperature; this is uniformly distributed in the interval 0.5 ± 0.3 keV. Data from Ponman et al. (1996), solid squares; David et al. 1993, open squares.

Fig. 3.— 3a: The average local luminosity function (solid line), and that evolved out to $z = 0.7$ (dashed line) are computed for the shock model and TCDM cosmogony. The data are from Ebeling et al. 1997.
 3b: Same as fig. 3a for the local temperature function (solid line), and that evolved out to $z = 0.5$ (dashed line). The data are from Henry & Arnaud (1991).
 3c: The predicted source counts are compared with data by Rosati et al. (1997; solid squares) and by Piccinotti et al. (1982; solid triangle). Solid line: $\sigma_8 = 0.66$; dotted line: $\sigma_8 = 0.55$.
 3d: Contribution of the sources with $F < 410^{-14}$ erg/cm²s to the XRB, compared with the observed values (open stars, Hasinger et al. 1997) with a 70% contribution from the sources resolved by ROSAT subtracted out (solid squares).

Fig. 4.— The local luminosity function in OCDM with $\Omega_o = 0.3$ for the shock model (solid line) and for the adiabatic model (dashed line). Data as in fig. 2a.

Fig. 5.— Predictions for OCDM cosmogony with $\Omega_o = 0.5$.

5a: luminosity functions for the shock model with the appropriate $L - T$ relation: local (solid line) and evolved ($z = 0.7$, dashed line)

5b: Same as 5a, for the adiabatic model.

5c,5d: Same as in figs. 3c, 3d. Both the shock model

(solid line) and the adiabatic model (long dashed line) are shown.

Fig. 6.— Same as in figs. 5, but for Λ CDM cosmogony.

Fig. 7.— Fig. 7a: The predicted faint counts at $F = 4 \cdot 10^{-14}$ erg/s cm² are shown on logarithmic scales for the FULL range of Ω_o in Standard CDM cosmogony. The solid line is computed for the amplitude σ_8 of the perturbation spectrum corresponding to central values of the COBE normalization; the strips enclosed between the dashed and the dotted lines represent the uncertainties in σ_8 added to the intrinsic variance in L_o . The predictions from TCDM cosmogony (open stars) and from Λ CDM cosmogony (open circle) are also shown. The horizontal lines correspond to the upper and lower error bars of the data by Rosati et al. (1997).

Fig. 7b: Same of fig. 7a, but for the bright counts at $F = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-11}$ erg/s cm²; here the horizontal lines correspond to the errors estimated by Piccinotti et al. (1982).

Fig. 8.— The predicted contribution to the XRB (at $E \approx 1$ keV) of unresolved clusters and groups is shown for the whole range of Ω_o in Standard CDM cosmogony. The results for TCDM and Λ CDM cosmogonies are also shown with same symbols as in fig. 7. The horizontal lines correspond to the data by Hasinger et al. (1997), with the 70% contribution of resolved sources subtracted out.

Fig. 9.— This shows the 99% confidence contours for both the computed local luminosity function (solid lines) and the computed number counts (dotted lines), in the $L_{44} - \sigma_8$ plane ($L_{44} = L_o/10^{44}$ erg/s). The boxes indicate ± 1 standard deviations in σ_8 (corresponding to the COBE uncertainty) and in L_{44} (from our Monte Carlo $L - T$ relation). Data as in figs. 3-6.

Fig. 9a: Shock model with TCDM. This cosmogony is consistent with the counts within 2 standard deviations below σ_8 .

Fig 9b) Shock model with Λ CDM. This shows acceptable fits.

Fig. 9c) Adiabatic model with OCDM ($\Omega_o = 0.5$). The 99 % contours for the counts are outside the uncertainty box for σ_8 and L_{44} .

Fig. 9d) Shock model with OCDM ($\Omega_o = 0.5$). The counts are consistent within 2 standard deviations be-

low σ_8 .

Fig. 10.— Fig. 10a: Redshift distribution per steradian computed in the OCDM for bright fluxes $F \geq 10^{-13}$ erg cm $^{-2}$ sec $^{-1}$, (the corresponding luminosity functions are given in figs. 3, 5, 6). Solid line: shock model; dashed line: for the adiabatic model of Evrard & Henry (1991); dotted line: adiabatic model in the Kaiser (1991) version.

Fig. 10b: Redshift distribution per steradian computed in Λ CDM for fluxes $F \geq 4 \cdot 10^{-14}$ erg cm $^{-2}$ sec $^{-1}$. Lines as in fig. 10a.























